

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 16, 17 and 19 are amended in several particulars for purposes of clarity in accordance with current Office policy, to assist the examiner and to expedite compact prosecution of this application.

I. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the Examiner stated that the relay 20 comprising "R1 and R2" should be read --R3 and R4--. Figure 3 has been updated according to the Examiner's suggestion, but with R1 amended to R4 and R2 amended to R5 because as seen below R3 is already used. Further, in order to assist the Examiner in expediting the compact prosecution of the present application, a similar amendment was made in figure 5. According to 37 CFR 1.121 Manner of making amendments in application:

(d) *Drawings.* Application drawings are amended in the following manner: Any change to the application drawings must be submitted on a separate paper showing the proposed changes in red for approval by the examiner. Upon approval by the examiner, new drawings in compliance with §1.84 including the changes must be filed.

Therefore, according to 37 CFR §1.121, the change to drawing has been submitted on a separate sheet showing the proposed changes in red for approval by the examiner. Upon approval by the examiner, new drawings in compliance with §1.84 including the changes will

be filed.

Accordingly, a letter to the Office Draftsman accompanies this response. Indication in subsequent Office correspondence of the acceptance to the drawing corrections proposed in the letter, is requested to enable applicant to timely arrange for the corrections to be made prior to the date for payment of any issue fee. No new matter was added.

II. Specification

A. The Examiner stated that on page 13, lines 16 "turn-off LED 200." should be read -- turn-off LED 220--. The specification was updated according to the Examiner's suggestion.

B. The Examiner stated that on page 11, line 4, "R3" is not shown in figure 3. Figure 3 was amended to include "R3" where the second R2 was changed to R3 on the right side of LED 220 in figure 3. Therefore, according to 37 CFR §1.121, the change to drawing has been submitted on a separate sheet showing the proposed changes in red for approval by the examiner. Upon approval by the examiner, new drawings in compliance with §1.84 including the changes will be filed. Accordingly, as mentioned above, a letter to the Office Draftsman accompanies this response. Indication in subsequent Office correspondence of the acceptance to the drawing corrections proposed in the letter, is requested to enable Applicant to timely arrange for the corrections to be made prior to the date for payment of any issue fee.

C. The Examiner stated that Page 10, line 2, "R1 and R2" should be read --R3 and R4--. The specification was updated according to the Examiner's suggestion, but with R1 amended to R4 and R2 amended to R5 because as seen below R3 is already used.

In order to assist the Examiner to expedite the prosecution of the present application, other instances of "R1" and "R2" being changed to "R4" and "R5" were looked for and amended.

III. Claim Objections

The Examiner stated that Claims 1, 16, 17 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: "said computer" should be read --a computer--. The claims have been updated according to the Examiner's suggestion.

However, please note that in paper number 24? (paper number 26 was mentioned in the interview summary) of 22 April 2002, the Examiner stated that the above claim correction will be entered in an Examiner's amendment. Therefore, we assume that the Examiner's amendment was not entered and therefore we are updating the claims according to the Examiner's suggestion. Claims 12, 16, 17, and 19 are being amended according to the Examiner's suggestion only for formality reasons for the purposes of clarity in accordance with current Office policy, to assist the Examiner and to expedite compact prosecution of this application. The amendments to claims 12, 16, 17, and 19 were not made for any patentability reasons but only for formal matters as seen by the change of "said computer" to --a computer--.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-20 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards

as the invention.

A. Claims 12, 1, 5, 7, 10, 16, 17, and 19

The Examiner stated that as to claims 12, 1, 5, 7, 10, 16, 17, and 19, there are the indefinite signals "outputting a signal, outputting the same voltage signal, an initial signal, the outputted voltage signal, said output signal in the interfacing section," as recited in the claimed limitation.

The claims have been amended to make the claims more clear to the Examiner in regard to the Examiner's specific concerns. As seen for example in claims 12, 1, 5, 7, and 10, the interfacing section is outputting a voltage signal reflective of an originally inputted voltage signal, which is switched at a different time according to a result of inputting the display data channel.

It was further clarified in claims 16, 17, and 19 that the interfacing section is outputting a signal according to a result of the inputting of the display data channel.

B. Claims 12, 16, 17 and 19

The Examiner stated that as to claims 12, 16, 17 and 19, the claimed limitation recites "controlling said driving device by generating said predetermined electric signal; analyzing said output signal from said interfacing section; and determining whether said result of said inputting said display data channel is correct." The Examiner stated that the claimed limitation contains various inconsistencies and/or ambiguities so that the Examiner is unable to understand what

circuit control, analyze and determine of which signals are correct without further elaboration.

Respectfully, the Examiner's rejection is not fully clear. Respectfully, the Examiner bears the burden of showing that the proposed claim language is indefinite to one of skill in the art. The Examiner only states that various inconsistencies and/or ambiguities so that the Examiner is unable to understand what circuit control, analyze and determine of which signals are correct. Respectfully, it is not clear to the Applicant the reasons for those concerns and what specifically are those concerns for which the Examiner bears the burden of making a *prima facie* case of indefiniteness under 35USC§112(2nd paragraph). The Examiner must clearly define the problem and why it is a problem in connection with the claim definiteness. Stating only that there are various inconsistencies and/or ambiguities would not be proper and therefore fails to form a *prima facie* case.

The Examiner mentioned that he is unable to understand what circuit controls, analyzes and determines. Controlling, analyzing and the determination steps can be by a controller as mentioned in claim 1 or a programmable logic controller for controlling or determining steps as mentioned in claim 4 and supported by the specification. However, concerning method claims 12, 16, 17 and 19 it is respectfully, unnecessary to limit the claim structurally especially when it is clear as to the steps shown.

The Examiner mentioned about what signals are correct. Using claim 12 as an example claim, concerning the signals that the Examiner is not sure of, the "predetermined electric signal"

from the clause of “controlling said driving device” relates back to the clause “driving said inputting device with *a predetermined electric signal* by a driving device.” Concerning “said output signal” from the “analyzing” clause, the output signal relates to the signal that is outputted in the clause of “indicating.” All these signals are mentioned in the specification and are consistent with the specification.

IV. Art rejections.

In paper number 26, the Examiner stated that ‘No art rejection is being made at this time due to the indefiniteness of claims.’ The Applicant is very concerned by this statement. Respectfully, the Applicant would like to remind the Examiner as mentioned in paper number 22, it was the Examiner’s Supervisor that suggested adding the clause “, said interfacing section outputting the same voltage signal as an initial signal, the outputted voltage signal is switched at a different time according to a result of inputting the display data channel” to claim 12 for which the Examiner is now objecting to and the Examiner had ample opportunity over the previous 5 office actions to raise the issue concerning the above 35USC§112(2nd paragraph) concerns. Further, in the Examiner’s interview summary of 22 April 2002 (paper number 24?) and 25 February 2003 (paper number 22), it was stated that claims 1-20 would be allowable.

The Applicant made that amendment (paper number 23) to expedite the compact prosecution of the application and relied in good faith to the suggestions made at the office interview of 25 February 2003.

The concerns of this office action, since they should have been raised much earlier, have heavily delayed the Applicant's patent application. We would also like to remind the Examiner that if the Examiner now believes that further art rejections should be made, that the Applicant be given proper due process in defending such possible rejections.

V. Paper numbers.

On a minor note, the Applicant would like to bring to the attention of the Examiner that the current office action and the interview summary of the Examiner on 22 April 2003 are both numbered paper number 26. We assume that the interview summary of the Examiner of 22 April 2003 may be paper number 24 and the current office action is paper number 26.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. If there are any questions, the examiner is asked to contact the applicant's attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment. However, should any fees be incurred by this

PATENT
P55657

Amendment or other fees be incurred, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of such fees.

Respectfully submitted,




Robert E. Bushnell
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P55657
Date: 15 September 2003
I.D.: REB/SS



Annotated Sheet Showing Changes





Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

FIG 4C





FIG 5



25